

C O N F I D E N T I A L

Approved For Release 2003/09/30 : CIA-RDP79-00632A000100030006-1

U N I T E D S T A T E S I N T E L L I G E N C E B O A R D

Telecommunications Working Group

Minutes of the Eleventh Meeting, 16 November 1972

Members or Representatives Present

Chairman - [REDACTED]  
NSA - [REDACTED]  
DIA - [REDACTED]  
FBI - Mr. Bruce P. Fisher  
State - Mr. George A. Getman, Jr.  
Army - Major James E. McKeon  
Navy - Mr. D'armand Dochez  
Air Force - Captain Carroll Clabaugh  
CIA - [REDACTED]

Others Present

FBI - Mr. Alvin C. Frank

1. IRAC Review

Our Review of Intelligence Communications, submitted to the Intelligence Resources Advisory Committee, was discussed and its final disposition explained. We will have to reproduce additional copies for the membership as the IRAC has consumed more than we had anticipated.

2. T-Lines

It was reported that [REDACTED] Chief, Staff Communications Division, CIA is following up his sources in [REDACTED] to obtain availability and cost information. We have requested security clearances for a Vice President [REDACTED] to facilitate the generation of a tariff. Lacking a tariff, we will have to explore the possibility of requesting bids for T-1 lines on a contractual basis as did NSA in obtaining the lines [REDACTED]

C O N F I D E N T I A L

Approved For Release 2003/09/30 : CIA-RDP79-00632A000100030006-1

3. Technical Panel Report

25X1A Captain Clabaugh stated he had been talking to several contractors relative to a study of the nodal design question. [ ] reviewed the written report of the Technical Panel and its recommendations. The Group withheld a decision on the expenditure of \$200,000 for hardware and software to cope with IWIN. Rather, it was the consensus that we merely state to IHC (to whom we owe a report) that [ ] is capable of handling the IWIN transmission requirement. We clarified the objective of the Technical Panel somewhat by agreeing to address the questions raised in the IDEW Report on manner in which nodal points are to be engineered. Captain Clabaugh reported that Mr. Richard Day, previously the proponent for a hardware/multiplex node, now concurs in the computer buffering at nodes. It was suggested that the Technical Panel review the work done by [ ] 25X1A relative to COINS-II circuitry and front-ending with COPE Controllers.

4. The Future of the TWG

25X1A The attached paper was distributed to the membership as a device to stimulate discussion of the future of communications representation on intra-community committees or groups. [ ] read to the Group his informal note to the Chairman, Intelligence Information Handling Committee, re the three-legged stool approach. Considerable discussion ensued with regard to the difficulty in establishing the line of demarcation between data processing, teleprocessing and telecommunications and whether the stool should be two-legged or three-legged. The consensus was three-legged. The following points were made during the discussion:

Communications elements should have representation within the USIB or the IC structure.

Preferably, the representation would be joint, in concert with bona fide users and data processors.

The possibility of a restructured IHC, with three sub-committees -- Users, ADPers and Communicators -- had certain appeal.

It was mandatory that Users have continuing representation in order to influence the efforts of their supporters in ADP and Telecommunications.

The Secretary will prepare a draft memorandum to the USIB outlining our recommendations. This draft will be reviewed at TWG December Meeting.

5. Errata

DoD efforts to consolidate requirements for telecommunications support to DoD intelligence data handling was discussed. Apparently DCA is fostering this move which seems to parallel the mission of the TWG.

The Secretary will prepare a draft Annual Report for consideration of the membership before submission to the USIB.

The difficulty in obtaining definitive statements of requirements from customer or user elements was covered in some detail. It was agreed that users had difficulty in translating their desires for service into meaningful statements of need as well as difficulty in anticipating future needs for support. It was suggested that we ask users to state the broad objectives they wished to obtain rather than providing us with definitive specifications. Knowing their objectives, we should be able to translate them into meaningful statements of requirements. The need for continuing intercourse with users was reiterated.

The conversion of CSOC (Current SIGINT Operations Center) to NSOC (National SIGINT Operations Center) was mentioned [redacted] The capabilities of the latter are considerably enhanced over those enjoyed by CSOC.

Mention was made also of an interagency study group which is addressing the indications and warning question and might influence the IWIN decision.

6. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the TWG will be held at the CIA 25X1A Headquarters Building on 21 December 1972 at 1400 hours.

Distribution:

TWG Members, Observers

Chairman, IHC

Approved For Release 2003/09/30 : CIA-RDP79-00632A000100030006-1

UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE BOARD

Telecommunications Working Group

The following comments are designed to stimulate discussion on the future of the TWG or a successor organization. As you will recall, we were given two charges at the time the Working Group was established: 1) to develop an inventory of community resources; and, 2) to make recommendations to the USIB concerning the need for a permanent body to deal with community telecommunications matters.

It would appear from comments heard to date that there is agreement among us that our periodic meetings and formalized structure serves a good purpose and should be continued. Some benefits have accrued to the community through the establishment of the TWG and some additional progress toward improved communications appears in the offing.

Given general agreement with the foregoing, it is suggested that we so inform the United States Intelligence Board.

Whatever guise the TWG takes on, i.e., a Committee of the USIB, a Subcommittee of the Intelligence Information Handling Committee, etc., the body should be a policy determining group. Subordinated to this policy element we would envision panels and task units to:

- Deal with complex technical questions and studies.
- Conduct special studies and reviews for the USIB or the IC Staff.
- Review and establish appropriate community requirements.
- Plan broad, intra-community systems.

Representation on the part of communicators should be consistent with level of agency and departmental representation on the IHC and similar groups.

It has been suggested that a new IHC be constituted with co-equal representation on the committee by Users, ADP'ers and Communicators. As the three disciplines are interdependent, this type of an arrangement would make considerable sense, particularly in the economies to be realized through the use of one Executive Secretariat Staff. It would also further the exchange of ideas and enhance communications between the three groups -- a highly desirable feature. There is some question as to who or what should chair such a group. Some people think it should be a technical person, others think it should be a User.